UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,559	02/09/2004	Clifford F. Biddulph	PVOZ 200015US01	8972
27885 FAY SHARPE	7590 09/17/201 LLP	EXAMINER		
	renue, 5th Floor	ZHENG, LOIS L		
The Halle Build Cleveland, OH			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/17/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/774,559	BIDDULPH ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
LOIS ZHENG	1793		

	LOIS ZITENG	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 September 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☑ The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>7 September 2010</u> . A b			
the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), of appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply <u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**	al	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	ion coponaing manner or innain, rej		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	,	•	J
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	I NOT I II II II II II	PC 6 11	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	ondition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/ Roy King/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that the claimed coating solution produces a single layer black chromate conversion coating while the black chromate conversion coating of WO'902 comprises two layers formed by two coating steps, wherein a top layer is required for the maintenance of the black color.

The examiner does not find applicant's argument persuasive because the instant claims only recite that the claimed coating soluiton produces a black chromate conversion coating and does not require a specific degree of blackness in the chromate coating. The first coating solution as taught by WO'902 is materially significantly similar to the claimed coating solution and also comprises phosphate, Fe, Co and Ni which are components known to contribute to the formation of a black coating. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected with success that the first coating solution as taught by WO'902 would have also formed a black chromate coating.

Applicant further argues that there is no motivation to alter the amounts of sulfuric and/or nitric acid in WO'902 to adjust pH since the pH of the claimed solution within the pH range of WO'902.

The examiner does not find applicant's argument convincing because WO'902 teaches using sulfuric and/or nitric acid for pH control, which reflects that the amounts of sulfuric and/or nitric acid are result effective variables which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have manipulated them via routine optimization in order to control pH of the coating solution.

Applicant further argues that black-color forming components such as a dye, or Fe, Co, Ni, or phosphate would have been added to the top coat of Oshima.

The examiner does not find applicant's argument convincing because WO'902 specifically teaches that black color contributing components such as phosphate, Co, Fe and Ni can be added to the first coating solution to promote a black conversion coating (see third paragraph on Page 6 of the non-final office action mailed 25 June 2009). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have incorporated phosphate, Co, Fe and Ni as taught by WO'902 into the base coating solution of Oshima in order to achieve a black conversion coating.